

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Status of the Application**

Claims 1-112 were pending in the application prior to this submission. All of pending claims 1-112 were rejected by the Examiner in the previous Final Office Action, which was subsequently affirmed in-part by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI).

Claim 112 has been amended herein. No new matter has been introduced with this amendment, and thus, entry and consideration are respectfully requested.

### **II. Examiner Interview**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for setting aside time to discuss the above-identified application on August 5, 2009. Applicants requested that the Examiner clarify the issues that were identified in the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated July 27, 2009. The Examiner provided additional input regarding these issues and suggestions for proceeding with the application. Applicants have formulated this response in view of these suggestions. Again, Applicants greatly appreciate the comments provided during the Examiner Interview.

### **III. Response to Rejections under 35 USC §112, Second Paragraph**

The Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI) presents a new grounds of rejection in the decision. In particular, the BPAI asserts that “PID” and “multicast IP address” as recited in dependent claim 112 lacks antecedent basis in claim 1, and thus claim 112 is indefinite.

In response to the 35 USC §112, second paragraph, rejection, Applicants have amended the language indicated as problematic by the BPAI to recite “a PID to a multicast IP address.” Applicants believe that no further antecedent basis issues exist in the pending claims.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 USC §112, second paragraph, rejection to claim 112 now be withdrawn.

### **IV. Response to Rejections under 35 USC §102(a) and 35 USC §103(a)**

In the decision, the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI) upheld the previous rejections to the pending claims in view of the cited references with the exception of claim 112, which was subsequently rejected by the board under a new grounds (under 35 USC

§112, second paragraph). More specifically, “...the Examiner has not demonstrated, much less asserted, that the features recited in claim 112 are disclosed in Momirov...” (Decision, page 12).

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the claim amendments and remarks now presented herein. Applicants respectfully assert that claim 112, as amended, is free of formal issues and is further distinguishable from the cited references taken alone or in combination. In particular, the Bigham (of record), Momirov (of record) and Chauvel (of record) references do not recite or imply establishing selection criteria “without the use of tables used to link a PID to a multicast IP address” as recited in amended claim 112.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully assert that at least claim 112, as amended, is distinguishable from the previously cited references, taken alone or in combination. Applicants therefore request that the 35 USC §102(a) rejection to claim 112 now be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

### AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. **504827**, Order No. 1004289-033US (4208-4028).

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. **504827**, Order No. 1004289-033US (4208-4028).

Respectfully submitted,  
LOCKE LORD BISSELL & LIDDELL

Dated: August 17, 2009

By:



---

Elliot L. Frank  
Registration No. 56,641

Correspondence Address:

Address Associated With Customer Number:

**85775**

(212) 415-8600 Telephone  
(212) 303-2754 Facsimile